

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,276	12/12/2003	Han Choon Lee	040044-0307078	8236
	7590 03/30/2005		EXAMINER	
PILLSBURY WINTHROP, LLP P.O. BOX 10500			NGUYEN, THANH T	
MCLEAN, V.			ART UNIT PAPER NUMBE	
			2813	
			DATE MAILED: 03/30/2005	5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	•			_ <i>1</i> 1′ F			
		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/733,276	LEE, HAN CHOON				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Thanh T. Nguyen	2813				
Period f	The MAILING DATE of this communication aport Reply	ppears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address	5			
THE - External control	MORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REP MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. e period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a re O period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory perioure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statureply received by the Office later than three months after the mailined patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	l. 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a sply within the statutory minimum of thi d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI tte, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this commun BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133)	nication.			
Status							
1)[Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12	January 2005.					
•	This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3) 🗌							
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposi	tion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 2,4,5,8,9,11,13 and 14 is/are pendi						
E)[]	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdr	awn from consideration.					
·] Claim(s) is/are allowed. ☑ Claim(s) <u>2, 4-5, 8-9, 11, 13-14</u> is/are rejected.						
•	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	a.					
	Claim(s) israte objected to: Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applica	tion Papers		•				
9)	The specification is objected to by the Exami	ner.					
,	0) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre	ection is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.	121(d).			
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the	Examiner. Note the attache	d Office Action or form PTO-1	52.			
Priority	under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority docume	nts have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority docume3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority			je			
	application from the International Bure	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •					
*	See the attached detailed Office action for a li	st of the certified copies no	l received.				
Attachme	nt(s)			,			
	ice of References Cited (PTO-892)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
	ice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) rmation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0	(98) 5) Notice of	Informal Patent Application (PTO-152))			
	er No(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	<u></u> .				

Art Unit: 2813

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 4, 8, 13 are stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,303) as previously applied.

Referring to figures 1-4, Lin teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising:

Forming a first insulating layer (38) on a semiconductor substrate (10);

Forming a barrier layer (54), forming a copper seed (see col. 4, lines 23-34) first conductive line (56) by depositing a conductive material on the first insulating layer and selectively pattern the conductive material (see figure 3);

Forming a second insulating layer (70/72) by depositing an insulating material on top of the substrate (10) including on the first conductive line (56);

Art Unit: 2813

Forming a via hole (76) and a trench (74) by selectively patterning the second in order to expose a certain portion of the first conductive line (56, see figure 3); and

Removing a natural oxide layer (CuO, see col. 3, lines 48-67, col. 4, lines 1-10), formed on the first conductive line (56) through natural oxidation of the first conductive line, by heat treating in an H₂+CO gas atmosphere (see col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding to claim 13, repeating the step (see col. 4, lines 34-38).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 2, 5, 9, 11, 14 stand are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lin (U.S. Patent No. 6,218,303) as applied to claims 4, 8, 13 above in view of Hasunuma et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,090,701) as previously applied.

Referring to figures 1-4, Lin teaches a method of manufacturing a semiconductor device comprising:

Forming a first insulating layer (38) on a semiconductor substrate (10);

Forming a barrier layer (54), forming a copper seed (see col. 4, lines 23-34) first conductive line (copper, 56, meeting claims 2, 11) by depositing a conductive material on the first insulating layer and selectively pattern the conductive material (see figure 3);

Art Unit: 2813

Forming a second insulating layer (70/72) by depositing an insulating material on top of the substrate (10) including on the first conductive line (56);

Forming a via hole (76) and a trench (74) by selectively patterning the second in order to expose a certain portion of the first conductive line (56, see figure 3); and

Removing a natural oxide layer (CuO, see col. 3, lines 48-67, col. 4, lines 1-10), formed on the first conductive line (56) through natural oxidation of the first conductive line, by heat treating in an H₂+CO gas atmosphere (see col. 3, lines 57-67).

Regarding to claim 13, repeating the step (see col. 4, lines 34-38).

However, the reference does not teach the temperature range.

The temperature range of claims 5, 9, 14 are considered to involve routine optimization while has been held to be within the level of ordinary skill in the art. As noted in In re Aller, the selection of reaction parameters such as temperature and concentration would have been obvious:

ANormally, it is to be expected that a change in temperature, or in concentration, or in both, would be an unpatentable modification. Under some circumstances, however, changes such as these may impart patentability to a process if the particular ranges claimed produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely degree from the results of the prior art...such ranges are termed Acritical ranges and the applicant has the burden of proving such criticality.... More particularly, where the general conditions of a claim are disclosed in the prior art, it is not inventive to discover the optimum or workable ranges by routine experimentation.

In re Aller 105 USPQ233, 255 (CCPA 1955). See also In re Waite 77 USPQ 586 (CCPA 1948); In re Scherl 70 USPQ 204 (CCPA 1946); In re Irmscher 66 USPQ 314 (CCPA 1945); In re Norman 66 USPQ 308 (CCPA 1945); In re Swenson 56 USPQ 372 (CCPA 1942); In re Sola 25 USPQ 433 (CCPA 1935); In re Dreyfus 24 USPQ 52 (CCPA 1934).

Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the requisite art at the time the invention was made would have used any temperature range suitable to the method in process of Lin in order to optimize the process.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 1/12/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant contends that none of the prior art disclose selectively pattern a conductive material deposited on the first insulating layer. In response to applicant that Lin clearly teaches selectively pattern a conductive material deposited on the first insulating layer (layer 56 is selectively pattern because its pattern forms only in the opening not any other place (see figure 3 for detail wherein the metal forms only in the opening)).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2813

Page 6

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-1695, or by Email via address Thanh.Nguyen@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 6:00AM to 3:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Whitehead, Jr., can be reached on (571) 272-1702. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956 (See MPEP 203.08).

Thanh Nguyen

Patent Examiner

Patent Examining Group 2800

TTN